

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EMMA C., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
DELAINE EASTIN, et al.
Defendants.

Case No. 96-cv-04179-TEH

REVISED ORDER ON FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

It has come to the Court’s attention that the Monitor’s budget was incorrectly allocated in the Court’s recent Budget Order (Docket No. 2064). Consistent with the long-standing principle that State Defendants should share a portion (20% this year) of the costs for District-related expenses, the appropriate allocation of the Monitor’s budget should be as follows:

Budget Items		CDE		District	
		Allocation	Amount	Allocation	Amount
Office	\$86,767	60.00%	\$52,060.20	40.00%	\$34,706.80
Consultants	\$108,000	40.00%	\$43,200	60.00%	\$64,800
Parent Advocacy ¹	\$74,000	20.00%	\$14,800	80.00%	\$59,200
Monitor's Salary	\$140,000	60.00%	\$84,000	40.00%	\$56,000
Budget Totals	\$408,767	47.47%	\$194,060.20	52.53%	\$214,706.80

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 06/18/15

THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge

¹ The budget item for “Parent Advocacy” remains unchanged as it was correctly allocated at 20%/80% in the previous Order.